



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/709,230	04/22/2004	Terrence M. Doeberl	F-682-O1	3229

919 7590 10/29/2009  
PITNEY BOWES INC.  
35 WATERVIEW DRIVE  
MSC 26-22  
SHELTON, CT 06484-3000

EXAMINER
----------

ADE, OGER GARCIA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3687

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

10/29/2009

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

iptl@pb.com

Art Unit: 3687



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/709,230  
Filing Date: April 22, 2004  
Appellant(s): DOEBERL ET AL.

George M. Macdonald  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed **06.15.2009** appealing from the Office action mailed **05.20.2008**.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

**(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

***Double Patenting***

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

**Claims 1-20** are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-5, and 11-24 of copending Application No. 10/249,615. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims are directed to the same invention. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

**Claims 1-20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Melby et al. [US 6,952,680], and further in view of Liang et al. [US 7,315,887 B1].

**As per claims 1-6, 8-11, and 13-20**, Melby discloses a computer implemented method for providing asset placement analysis for an organization comprising:

obtaining historical asset usage data from the database using the computer server over a plurality of periods received from the plurality of assets using the computer server [see abstract (e.g. provide historical trends), and column 2: lines 1-5 (e.g. **historical access to the information associated with asset usage**)];

obtaining asset physical placement data associated with the plurality of assets over the plurality of periods using the computer server [see column 14: lines 32-36 (e.g. a pre-determined usage-pricing matrix)]; and

determining suggested alternate asset physical placement data using the asset usage data and the asset physical placement data, and providing the suggested alternate asset physical placement data using the computer server [see column 3: lines 16-20, via database 78, and via analysis controller 13, read as "**such identification information included, for example, data regarding the make, model, year, and serial number of the asset 11**"].

Melby discloses all the elements per claimed invention as explained above. Melby does not explicitly disclose a "*physical*" placement analysis for an organization. However, Liang discloses a physical placement analysis management for facilitating integration of communications network equipment or asset inventory management [see abstract, and as illustrated in figure 1 (e.g. blocks 120 and 155)].

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Liang to the teaching of Melby in order to provide a method for facilitating the management of a communication network asset item, a physical placement analysis of an asset item for

Art Unit: 3687

an organization, and a system-readable identification enables the physical asset manager to create the informational link between the on-line sub-object of the asset item and the off-line sub-object of the asset item [see summary of the invention].

**As per claims 7 and 12**, Melby discloses obtaining department data for a plurality of departments of the organization associated with the asset placement data specifying a plurality of locations each associated with the plurality of assets [see abstract (e.g. provide historical trends), and column 2: lines 1-5 (e.g. ***historical access to the information associated with asset usage***)];

determining peak usage for at least one of the departments using the historical asset usage data, the department data and the asset placement data [as illustrated in figure 6, ***a flow chart of a sub-system illustrating the analysis of asset-related information to determine responsibility and peak usage for asset utilization***]; and

suggesting at least one replacement asset for the at least one department [see paragraph bridging column 17 and 18 (e.g. ***the system to automatically order replacement parts for an inventory location***)].

Melby discloses all the elements per claimed invention as explained above. Melby does not explicitly disclose “*physical*” asset placement data, and “*physical*” location. However, Liang discloses a “*physical*” asset placement data and “*physical*” location [see abstract, and as illustrated in figure 1 (e.g. blocks 120 and 155)].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Liang to the teaching of Melby in order to provide a method for facilitating the management of a

Art Unit: 3687

communication network asset item, a physical placement analysis of an asset item for an organization, and a system-readable identification enables the physical asset manager to create the informational link between the on-line sub-object of the asset item and the off-line sub-object of the asset item [see summary of the invention].

#### **(10) Response to Argument**

Appellants' arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Appellants argue that Melby does not disclose "a replacement asset analysis and no suggestion of modeling a replacement asset costs based upon usage data collected for the installed asset". The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

In response to Appellants' argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., **modeling a replacement asset cost**) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

However, Melby discloses a computer based system that automatically gathers, analyzes, and delivers information relating to the procurement and utilization of a **plurality of such assets**, such as a **fleet of industrial equipment** (see abstract), and a plurality of **stationary machines** used in a manufacturing environment (see paragraph bridging columns 7 and 8).

Furthermore, Liang discloses a physical asset management system that is capable of carrying-out a method for facilitating integration of communications network



Art Unit: 3687

equipment inventory management. Liang further discloses a method that includes assigning system-readable identification to an asset item of a communication network, receiving the system-readable identification of the asset item at a physical asset manager in response to installing the asset item in the communication network, and creating an informational link between an on-line sub-object of the asset item and an off-line sub-object of the asset item. The system-readable identification is enabling the physical asset manager to create the informational link between the on-line sub-object of the asset item and the off-line sub-object of the asset item.

Appellant also argue that Melby does not discloses or suggest taking historical usage data over a plurality of periods. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Melby discloses a remote analysis system that automatically analyzes newly provided information and schedules maintenance as required. Information that is associated with the maintenance is also recorded electronically to maximize efficiency, **provide historical trends**, automate billing, and control inventory levels (see abstract, and column 2: lines 1-15).

Appellants further that Melby does not discloses “using a best fit algorithm”. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Melby discloses a conventional error checking algorithm that can be used to confirm a best fit or accuracy and completeness (see column 7: lines 50-53).

In response to applicant's argument that the references are not properly combined, the Examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention

Art Unit: 3687

where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

In this case, the references are selected as being reasonably pertinent to the problem based on the judgment of a person having ordinary skill in the art. It is necessary to consider the reality of the circumstances, in other words, common sense in deciding in which fields a person of ordinary skill would reasonably be expected to look for a solution to the problem facing the inventor. *In re Wood*, 599 F.2d 1032, 1036, (C.C.P.A. 1979). A reference is either in the field of the applicant's endeavor or is reasonably pertinent to the problem with which the inventor was concerned in order to rely on that reference as basis of rejection. *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1447 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

The elements are all known but not combined as claimed. The technical ability exists to combine the elements as claimed and the results of the combination are predictable. When combined, the elements perform the same function as they did separately. The prior art differs from the claim by the substitution of some components. The substituted components were known. The technical ability existed to substitute the components as claimed and the result of the substitution is predictable.

Art Unit: 3687

**(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Garcia Ade/

Examiner, Art Unit 3687

/Matthew S Gart/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3687

Conferees:

/Matthew S Gart/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3687

Vincent Millin/vm/

Appeals Practice Specialist